

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
 )  
 Petitioner, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 KENDRICK R. DOUGLAS, )  
 )  
 Respondent. )

Case 5:10-hc-02158-D Document 45 Filed 05/01/12 Page 1 of 2

commitment” and wishes that the date of the hearing before Judge Gates be considered as his date of commitment. Resp’t Mot. [D.E. 44] 1–2.

“The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the [magistrate judge’s] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (alteration in original) (emphasis and quotation omitted); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Id. (quotation omitted).

There are no objections to the M&R, and the court finds no clear error on the face of the record. Therefore, the court adopts the M&R [D.E. 43]. The court GRANTS Douglas’s motion [D.E. 44] and enters its order nunc pro tunc to November 18, 2011.

SO ORDERED. This 1 day of May 2012.

  
JAMES C. DEVER III  
Chief United States District Judge